



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

power, and thou hast need. I, therefore, absolve thee from all thy sins, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen. May the passion of our Lord Jesus Christ, the merits of the Blessed Virgin Mary, and of all the saints, may whatever good thou shalt do, and whatever evil thou shalt suffer, be to thee unto the remission of sins, the increase of grace, and the recompense of life everlasting. Amen." p. 182.—Ed. 1851, R. Coyne, Capel-street, Dublin, printer and bookseller to the Roman Catholic College, Maynooth.

Such instances might be multiplied almost indefinitely. They seem to set at rest the question as to whether Roman Catholics are taught to pray through the merits of the Virgin Mary.

We, of course, do not mean to say that they do not also trust in the merits of Christ; but we do say, that such prayers are dishonouring to the merits of the Saviour, and revolting to the spirit of true Christianity. Not content with the infinitely precious merits of Christ, they require, also, the merits of Mary, as if the merits of Jesus Christ were not adequate, without pleading the merits of Mary also—as if the Creator needed the assistance of any creature, however exalted, to complete his work.

But there is a second assertion, that though they pray to Mary, it is only for her intercession; and that they never suppose that she has any power, or can herself do anything, but only that she intercedes for those who pray to her.

This, likewise, is a question of fact, and must be determined, not by the statement of any individual as to his own belief or practice, but by evidence.

The evidence is abundant; the only difficulty is in selection; and our space at present compels us to be brief.

In the "Brief Account of Indulgences conferred on the Order of the Virgin Mary of Mount Carmel" (p. 13), occurs the following passage:—

"The affection of an earthly mother bears no proportion to that of the Virgin, who, to show herself truly the mother of those who wear her holy scapular, did not rest fully satisfied with having preserved them from bodily harm, and kept them out of hell, as far as lies in her, through the mediation of her powerful protection, but also promised as a truly loving Mother, not enduring the sight of her dear and beloved children suffering in the flames of Purgatory, that she would free them as soon as possible, particularly on the first Saturday after their death, as being a day set aside for her honour, and bring them to eternal joy in paradise."

That this is not by way merely of prayer to God or intercession with her Son to free them from Purgatory, but by her own personal act, is put beyond dispute by the words of the Bull of Pope John XXII., bearing date March 3, 1322, generally known as "The Sabbatine Bull." As this may be unknown to many of our readers, we transcribe the words of it, which they may also see, given verbatim, in the "Devotion to our Lady of Mount Carmel"† (p. 17):—

"One day that Pope John XXII. had, as usual, risen very early to pour forth his soul in prayer, being on his knees, in a kind of ecstasy, the Queen of Heaven, the comfort of the afflicted, appeared to him, surrounded with supernatural light, and wearing the Carmelite habit, and spoke thus to him:—'John, vicar of my Son, it is to me you are indebted for your exaltation to the dignity which you enjoy, in consequence of my solicitations in your behalf with my Divine Son, and as I have delivered you from the snares of your enemies, so do I expect that you will give ample and favourable confirmation of the holy Carmelite order, which was first instituted on Mount Carmel, and which, descending from Elias and Eliseus, has been always particularly devoted to me. . . . And if among the Religious or Brethren of the Confraternity, who depart out of this life, there shall be any who for their sins have been cast into Purgatory, I, their glorious Mother, will descend in the midst of them into Purgatory, on the Saturday after their death, and take them up to the holy mountain, in the happy regions of eternal life.'"

This Bull was confirmed, in 1412, by Pope Alexander V., by another Bull, which commences "Tenore ejusdam privilegii;" and, again, by Pope Clement VII., in 1524, in the Bull "Dilecti filii," which, after recounting the indulgences and privileges given to the Carmelites, continues thus:—"And, on their departure from this life, the glorious Virgin Mother of God herself will, on the Saturday succeeding the death of the members, whether brother monks or sister nuns, visit them, and free their souls from the punishment of Purgatory. Pius V. conferred the same privileges, in a Bull, "Suprema dispositione," dated 18th February, 1566, and Pope Gregory XIII., in the Bull, "Ut laudes," 18th September, 1577. The same statements are reiterated in a work, entitled the "Wonders of God," published, with authority, at Rome itself, in 1841, under the pontificate of Pope Gregory XVI., vol. ii., p. 31.

Here, then, we have no private statement, but the Bull

of one Pope confirmed by four other Bulls, from four subsequent Popes, and republished, by authority, at Rome, so late as 1841, teaching that the Virgin Mary herself visits Purgatory every Saturday, and releases certain privileged persons.

We might add, if space permitted, many further proofs that the power attributed to Mary is not that of mere prayer or intercession—though, doubtless, she is constantly prayed to both as intercessor and mediatrix. But here we must close our observations for the present, hoping to resume them at no distant period.

ROMAN CATHOLIC MORAL THEOLOGY.

In our last number we inserted an article, which was intended to be the first of a series, on the moral teaching of the Church of Rome, and we gave some reasons for thinking that the "moral theology" of St. Alphonsus de Liguori was the most authentic representative of that teaching to which we could refer; but we are met here by some preliminary objections of Doctor Wiseman,* which we are bound to consider. We are obliged somewhat to compress Dr. Wiseman's essay; but we shall faithfully reproduce all his arguments, and, as far as we can, preserve his words. His point is, that the moral theology of St. Liguori is a book written for the guidance of confessors, and not for general instruction in morality. The "moral theology" of the Church, he tells us—which is altogether remedial of sin committed—is quite different from her moral teaching, which is directed to the formation of character.

The office of a confessor may be compared to that of a physician. "Sin is the 'disease'; the state of grace is the condition of spiritual health, and the sacrament of penance is the ordained means of recovery. The confessor, like the physician, is bound, by the obligations of his office, to get his patient out of trouble as well as he can; and treatises of moral theology are his guides as to the most improved method of doing his work." But these treatises, which are mainly occupied with the circumstances of disease, are quite different from those which give directions to the healthy how they may avoid sickness. "To confound the one with the other is as absurd as to confound a book of culinary receipts with one of medical prescriptions. If a gentleman in a good state of health were to propose sustaining himself upon beef-tea and barley-water, instead of roast mutton and port wine, he would not make a greater mistake than would the Catholic who should seek for spiritual direction in the pages of Busenbaum, or any other work of the kind."

True, Cardinal Wiseman. But suppose a man wished to know whether certain symptoms with which he found himself affected were consistent with sound health, or whether they indicated disease, he would consult a medical work, and not a treatise on diet. If a Roman Catholic is in doubt whether certain actions are, in the opinion of his Church, sinful or innocent, we should say that the most proper work he can consult is one of those treatises which inform confessors whether such actions are justifiable, or whether they are venial or mortal sins—whether they require absolution or not. If the objection brought against Liguori had been, that he was too strict and ascetic, then it might have been in point to say, "we prescribe penances to those who have fallen into sin, which we do not think it necessary to impose on those who have not erred. You must not confound the medicine which is necessary for the restoration of the sick with the ordinary diet of Christians." But, in fact, the objection is quite the reverse. The charge is, that the morality of Liguori is altogether too lax—that he regards as innocent, equivocations which Protestant gentlemen feel to be shameful lying; and treats as pardonable, appropriation of other men's goods, which we should call downright stealing. What answer to this is it to say, that such lessons are only intended to be given in the confessional? Are truth and honesty to be compared to roast mutton and port wine? Are they virtues which a Christian can only safely practise when he is in rude spiritual health, but which he cannot indulge in if, through frailty, he has fallen into sin? Surely, if we are asked what is sin, and what is not, we must give the same answer, whether saint or sinner ask the question. Let us hear, however, what reasons Dr. Wiseman gives for the opposite opinion. Our quotation will be a long one, but it is necessary to do justice to the cardinal's argument.

"A physician must provide, not for what he himself might desire, but for what his patient can bear. But his object, above all, must be that of hindering despondency. In the pursuit of this object, he will practise a prudent reserve in speaking to his patient; he will make the best even of serious disease, not from any love of dissembling, still less any habitual untruthfulness, but simply in pursuit of his object, which is, to lighten, not to aggravate; to heal, not to wound. A pretty kind of doctor would he be, who should go about frightening his patients in their first respite after danger, and ere they were well out of it, by telling them, in their feeble state, all that he would say of their maladies to their friends in health, or to themselves when recovered! When he sees them too easily elated, ready to presume upon a

momentary amendment, or to calculate upon years, when he knows their days to be numbered, then, cautiously and kindly, but firmly, he advises them of the danger, or, at least, moderates their sanguine hopes. But, in a case where calmness and confidence are the very conditions of recovery, to speak to a sick man of his disease, after the fact, in the same terms in which you would speak to a sound man of the same disease, before it, would be a course of action for which worldly men would very soon find a suitable, and not very complimentary description, were it to be practised in regard to themselves and their families.

"The penitent, moreover, has a claim upon his confessor for tenderness, which is peculiar to himself. A sick man does no violence to his natural feelings in having recourse to a physician; on the contrary, he acts in obedience to them. He feels his malady, which all sinners unhappily do not. And even when sinners are moved by the promptings of divine grace to go to a confessor and disburden their consciences, what a victory must they not gain over their self-love! They may, if they please, keep their secret to themselves, so that even their best friends shall not know of it. Unlike the man attacked with illness, they have neither natural inclination within, nor friends without, to force them on using remedies. They may stay away from confession if they please, but they actually prefer, for their souls' health, to do a thing most repulsive to their natural self-love. Are such the persons for a sinner, like themselves, to frighten and discourage? Is it for him to exaggerate, or even to exhibit, in formal shape, the sin which, as it is, appals them by its hideous appearance? Does not human kindness, as well as sacerdotal duty, suggest to a confessor the course of gentleness and moderation? And has not his Lord warned him against bruising the broken reed and quenching the smouldering flax? We repeat, it is one thing to warn from mortal sin as a danger, quite another to deal with it as a fact; and it would be just as unchristian to use, in the confessional, the language of the pulpit, as to tell men, whom we wish to maintain in innocence, of all the excuses which might be made for them, if, unhappily, they should fall into sin.

"It may be said, indeed, that a sin is as much a sin at one time as at another, and that the course we are now advocating is favourable to hypocrisy and falsehood. But how different is the fact? The preacher, or spiritual director, speaks of sin, in the abstract, as hateful to God and destructive of the soul. The confessor, on the contrary, who deals with sin as a fact, has to view it in connection with all its circumstances, in the particular case—such as the amount of knowledge or deliberation with which it was committed, and the degree of completeness to which it was carried; its place in the series of which it is one; its relation to the temperament and situation of the penitent, &c. It will be hard, indeed, if there be no extenuating circumstances in the particular instance; one fact to move compassion and suggest tenderness there must always be—the fact of the confession itself. A penitent always deserves mercy, but a hearer does not even always claim it.

"Hence it is, that so great a part of moral theology consists in framing excuses for sinners. The consideration of favourable circumstances in every variety of form, or in their effect, whether upon the intention of the agent, or the character of the act; the possibility of reducing the sin to some less aggravated class of transgressions, or of accounting for it upon some indulgent hypothesis; the admissibility, without compromise, of some lenient construction, or the adoption of some moderate opinion of a divine of weight, upon which the confessor, desiring to be lenient, might safely act. These and the like are topics which receive so prominent a place in our authorized treatises on confession, that it is no wonder if hasty observers should carry away from the perusal of them notions at variance with the strictness of Catholic morality, though a wonder it is that men of credit should persevere in misrepresentations, which have been so often and so completely exposed."

We do not think that Dr. Wiseman has a right to complain of misrepresentation; for it appears to us that, as to the matter of fact, he is quite agreed with the censurers of Liguori, and that his difference with them is only a matter of opinion. We have marked in italics his acknowledgment, that a great part of Roman Catholic works on moral theology is taken up in framing excuses for sinners, and he owns that hasty observers would carry from the perusal of them notions at variance with the strictness of Christian morality. As to the general tone of laxity, then, that pervades the moral theology of Liguori and his brethren, there is no dispute—*habemus confidentem rem*—and the only question to be discussed is, whether this ought to be the characteristic of a work intended to be a guide for confessors.

Now, the defence of Liguori that we have just copied, is based on an extraordinary confusion of thought. If Protestants denied the possibility of pardon for sin, even when repented of; if they required that a confessor should terrify his penitent with denunciation of judgment, and teach them to despair of the mercy of God, then it would be quite in point to say that a good physician would not needlessly alarm his patients, and it would be a fair answer to appeal to the example of our Lord himself, who would not break the bruised reed, nor

* Ed., Dublin, 1828.

† Published by Richardson (9, Capel-street, Dublin; 172, Fleet-street, London, and Derby) as revised and approved by a prelate of the Carmelite order.

‡ "Die quo ab hoc seculo isti recedant, properto gradu accelerant Purgatorio, ego Mater gloriosa descendam Sabbato post eorum obitum, et quos invenero in Purgatorio liberabo, et eos in montem sanctum vite eterne reducam."

* See the "Dublin Review," October, 1851, p. 122, &c.

quench the smoking flax, and who "dismissed even the woman taken in adultery with the admonition, 'go, and sin no more.'" The fact is, however, that Protestants hold no such doctrines; they acknowledge the fullness of forgiveness which Christ is willing to bestow on penitent sinners, in terms as ample as can be desired; but they hold, that the first step, in order to obtain such forgiveness, must be, the conviction of sin, and sorrow for it. The penitent must *feel* his malady before he will accept the services of the physician. We find fault with Liguori, not because he teaches confessors to bestow forgiveness on sinners, but because, as Cardinal Wiseman acknowledges, he "makes excuses for sinners," and tries to show that the actions for which we condemn them are, in reality, not sinful, and do not require forgiveness.

It is one thing to *repudiate* a debt; another to acknowledge it, and ask, at the same time, to be forgiven it. The latter is the course which the sinner is directed to pursue by Protestant teachers; the former, that which he would be taught by confessors trained in the school of Wiseman and Liguori.

Let us, in fact, compare the different instruction which a penitent sinner would receive if he sought for spiritual consolation from a Protestant clergyman, and if he made his confession to one who adopted Dr. Wiseman's views as to the duties of a confessor. The Protestant clergyman, however tender his feelings towards the penitent might be, would never dream of giving him consolation by diminishing his conviction of the guilt of the sin which he had committed. He knows that there is no sin too great for the blood of Christ to blot out; while, therefore, he is able to repress every suggestion of despair by fixing the sinner's thoughts on that all-sufficient remedy, he would prefer to deepen in his mind his sense of the guilt of his sin, and endeavour to fix in his soul such a lasting abhorrence of it, as should prevent him from falling into the same sin again.

There are good reasons why a Roman Catholic clergyman, if really anxious for the moral improvement of his flock, should be even more careful than a Protestant clergyman to deepen convictions of sin before pronouncing words of comfort. For every one must admit that the Roman Catholic institution of confession has too often the effect of leading the penitent to suppose that he has got rid of the sin the moment the priest's absolution is pronounced. The Author of our nature has willed that the commission of sin should always be attended with certain remorse and uneasiness, and these uncomfortable feelings are the natural means provided to guard against the repetition of the sin. Now, one of the principal objects for which people resort to the confessional is, in order to get rid of those unpleasant feelings. A judicious confessor, therefore, would be careful how he removed these safeguards against future sin before he had taken advantage of them to gain a security for reformation. Just the opposite of this is the course which Jesuit confessors have been charged with pursuing. It might be expected that Cardinal Wiseman would have denied the truth of the accusation; but any one who reads over the passage we have cited will see that the method which Dr. Wiseman says a confessor ought to pursue, is precisely the same as that which Jesuit priests have been accused of pursuing.

According to him, it is the confessor's business to get his patient out of trouble as well as he can; and the very fact of the penitent's coming to him gives him a claim on his tenderness and compassion. He is to show this tenderness by putting in practice the lessons he has learned from the science of moral theology, in framing excuses for sinners. If he finds his penitent overwhelmed with undue sorrow for his sin, he is kindly to point out that the case was by no means so bad as might be supposed. He is to consider the "relation of the sin to the temperament and situation of the penitent." It was a sin to which, perhaps, he was greatly addicted, and from which the poor fellow would have found it difficult to abstain; or, perhaps, he had provocation, and so may stand excused. Then must be taken into consideration favourable circumstances with regard to the "intention of the agent." When we shall have expounded, in a future article, the Jesuit doctrine of "guiding the intention," the reader will see what resources this alone affords the confessor for reducing the character of the sin, and how fully they have been recognised by Cardinal Wiseman. Then, we are told, the confessor is to consider the possibility of "accounting for the sin upon some indulgent hypothesis, or the admissibility, without compromise, of some lenient construction, or the adoption of some moderate opinion of a divine of weight, upon which, desiring to be lenient, he might safely act." The reader will not understand the full force of these recommendations unless he is acquainted with the Jesuit "doctrine of probability," and knows how confessors are instructed that they may treat as innocent, actions, which they themselves believe to be sinful, provided that some respectable divine has pronounced them innocent. And so lax are the decisions of some of the Jesuit doctors, that a confessor, wishing to be indulgent, need scarcely have recourse to any other method than this of getting his patient quickly out of trouble.

We return, then, to Cardinal Wiseman's own illustration, and ask how a physician might best show his tenderness

to his patient. He would, to be sure, not needlessly terrify the sick man's friends, by expressing distrust of the ultimate result, provided the patient made use of the remedies which he knew were sufficient to overcome the disease. But would he show his leniency and moderation in the manner suggested by Cardinal Wiseman? According to him, the physician ought never to admit, if he could help it, that the patient was affected by serious disease, and ought to try to account for his distressing symptoms, on some lenient hypothesis. Perhaps they only indicate some small constitutional derangement—at all events, even if the physician cannot convince himself that they indicate mere trifling disease, still, if he can find in any approved medical work that the symptoms complained of might possibly exist without formidable disease, he is not to act on his own opinion, but he is to do everything in his power to avoid the employment of severe remedies. Now, how would our readers like to call in a medical man who told them that the rule of his practice was, never to employ a strong remedy if he could possibly help it; who, if he was called in to treat a bad fever, would say, "perhaps it is only a heavy cold;" or, if called in for a case of apoplexy, would say, "probably the patient is a man of sleepy habits, or possibly he has taken a trifle more than is good for him; let us deal leniently with him, and by no means have recourse to any severe remedy." We fancy our readers would not much admire the gentleness and moderation of such a physician; but would have recourse to the doctor who was not afraid to act "severely," provided that was the proper way to make them well.

We confess, then, that we cannot understand how our Roman Catholic friends, if they think over the matter, can have any confidence in the efficacy of absolutions pronounced by confessors who acknowledge that they act on such rules as Dr. Wiseman lays down. We do not say a word here against the efficacy of absolution in general. We are willing here, for the sake of argument, to accept the account which Roman Catholics give of it. But everyone is agreed that, in order that the absolution should be effectual, it must be pronounced with perfect understanding of the case—the remedy must be adapted to the disease. If the penitent mislead the confessor, and pass off on him his mortal sins for venial, and his venial sins for no sins at all, why, then, the absolution does not reach down to the root of the evil, and the penitent still remains loaded with the guilt of his sins. And it must be all the same if the confessor mislead himself; if he lay down such rules for his guidance as will always lead him to form too low an estimate of the guilt of his penitent. It will follow, then, too, that his spiritual remedies will not be proportioned to the malignity of his disease, and so the sinner will remain unabsolved and unforgiven.

It would be even well if the mischief were only that the one past sin remained without absolution. But what encouragement will the sinner receive for a repetition of his offence. When he goes as a penitent to his confessor, filled with remorse or uneasiness for his ill conduct, and when his spiritual adviser informs him that his scruples were unfounded; that his natural character, and the provocation he had received, must be regarded as mitigating circumstances, and that what he had done is, in the opinion of some grave doctor, no sin at all: what will be the practical effect of such teaching as this? Evidently that he will take care not to give himself unnecessary anxiety on another occasion, and that he will commit, without scruple, the actions which he has found by experience he may commit with impunity. To illustrate this, we may employ the example which Dr. Wiseman himself has selected. He says—"The nice distinctions, which our theologians draw, (between sins that destroy and such as only wound the soul, for instance) are apparently believed to be devised for the special purpose of enabling young Mr. A. to murder his enemy with only a venial quantity of deliberation, or Lady B. to play her cards so neatly as to commit a decided *faux pas* without forfeiting the good opinion of her spiritual adviser. Such an imagination is not less ludicrous than would be that of supposing all the vagabonds in Hampshire to subscribe, in order to get Mr. Justice Coleridge to go down to some central spot in the county, that they might repair into his presence, and consult him as to the approved method of house-breaking, or other such practices, so as to come off with the least quantity of punishment at the next ensuing Winchester Assizes."

Now, Dr. Wiseman must be very simple if he supposes that the vagabonds aforesaid need any other opportunity of instruction than the Winchester Assizes themselves. If they find that house-breakers are in the habit of getting off there with impunity, they will not require any further instruction to know how far it will be safe for themselves to venture in the same way; nor could they have a better instructor in vicious practices than a judge whose invariable rule was to secure the acquittal of the prisoners.

We think we need say no more as to the moral tendency of the general rules laid down by Liguori and approved by Dr. Wiseman; and we shall on a future occasion return to give some practical illustrations of the application of them.

THE ABBE LABORDE AT ROME.

(Continued from page 55.)

"XVIII. When the Episcopal Conferences were ended, on the 25th November, the great proportion of the bishops had not yet arrived. They arrived on the following days; but they had nothing more for them to do; and, indeed, they themselves had done nothing.

"XIX. It must here be observed, that the bishops of Spain had not answered the invitation they had received. They had urged three reasons which had hindered them presenting themselves:—The first, that it did not appear to them a fitting time to define this question; the second, that as the cholera was raging in Spain, they could not leave their flocks; the third, that the government opposed their journey. There came no more than one or two, and these for some particular motive. The Archbishop of Toledo, having some time before been promised the cardinalate, came to receive the cardinal's hat—as he has, in fact, received it in the public consistory, which took place in St. Peter's, on Thursday, the 31st November.

"XX. They have not had any conferences of the cardinals; there was only a secret consistory held on the 1st December. What was said there? What was done there? No one knows; but it is certain, that, had they wished, they might, in this one session, have examined the question to its root. Moreover (not to suffer any doubt), their part had been resolved upon—the Pope willed, and his will was known. For, according to the habitual customs of the Court of Rome, even the Sacred College believes itself warranted in always submitting in silence, as soon as the Pope has said, 'I will.'

"XXI. I will add some particulars with reference to those things which the newspapers published, after the account of the Abbé Gaume, about that 'unparalleled enthusiasm,' and that 'general intoxication' (of joy), in which 'Rome was plunged' on the 8th December. It was not possible, as has been seen, that I could have witnessed this; but it must have been, either that this enthusiasm and intoxication were a very sudden outburst, or that they had no other existence than in the heated imagination of the 'Apostolic Notary.'

"Up to the 7th, at two o'clock in the afternoon, when I departed from Rome, I can affirm that no symptom of this enthusiasm and intoxication had as yet presented itself. For five days, at least, the Cardinal Vicar had caused to be advertised a lengthy instruction, to prepare the people for this unparalleled event in the Church, and to animate their devotion. I have read it throughout on the walls of Rome, it enjoined prayers, sermons, and exhibitions of the holy Sacrament in the Churches. The solemn day approaching, a second exhortation followed the first. I had intended to inform myself accurately, both by my own experience and that of others, as to the sentiments with which the people were animated. With this design I visited many Churches, as well during the week, as on two consecutive Sundays, 26th November and 3rd December. I saw in many places the great scaffoldings of monuments prepared for the statue of the holy Virgin, much tapestry displayed, many draperies of all colours, many wax candles; this was the work of the Sacristans; but the enthusiasm of the people—the people—nowhere!

"XXII. During the week, I attended on one occasion an evening sermon, in St. Mary, of Ara Caeli, a large church, which had, at other times, been the Temple of Jupiter Capitolinus. In the middle of the nave, in front of a raised dais, on which a *co-délér* was preaching, I saw a small circle reserved for females, and in the sanctuary five or six religious of the house. I attended twice at the morning exercises, and at the High Mass, in the Church of the Holy Apostles. There were about fifty persons there, besides many who took the opportunity to see the Church, and were going in and out.

"XXIII. On Sunday, 26th November, I spent a great portion of the afternoon in the large parish church of St. Ambrose and St. Charles, in the Corso, in which the Holy Sacrament was exhibited all the day, for the appointed prayers. I hoped to have heard vespers there; but there were not any. In Rome, the *curés* do not give themselves the trouble to perform the office of vespers on Sunday in the parish churches. I wish to be candid—people came in some proportion, men and women, to adore the Holy Sacrament. Each fell upon his knees before the altar, richly illuminated, and withdrew. When I was retiring, I was induced, by the sound of the bell, to enter the Church of St. Lawrence, another parish church in the vicinity of the Corso, to attend at evening prayers. It had, also, but few people in the long aisles, fewer than were in St. Ambrose; but not at all the course that we are accustomed to see in France. On the same Sunday, and following (3rd December), I visited other parish churches at the time when vespers ought to have been sung—the Holy Sacrament was exhibited in these also. But, notwithstanding that, I attended in some well-disposed districts, where I saw no one but a priest in adoration before the altar, and three or four persons in the whole church.

"XXIV. On the latter Sunday, I proceeded as far as St. Mary Major, hoping to hear the Roman vespers at least once; for there is a Chapter there bound by the State to sing them. St. Mary Major is the first church in Rome after St. Peter's. This occurred in the midst of the *Novena*, and was the first Sunday in Advent. The Holy Sacrament was